

REMARKS

The Office Action dated November 27, 2002 has been received, its contents carefully noted, and the applied citations thoroughly considered. All rejections are respectfully traversed by virtue of the foregoing revisions and ensuing remarks. Undersigned also acknowledges the courtesies extended by the Examiner in recent discussions. These remarks will generally follow the Office Action's sequence:

The amendment filed July 12, 2002 (received July 17, 2002) which was not entered, has been re-presented. In addition, other amendments to the claims are made.

Most notably, the undersigned has deleted "knock-down coupling" from the claim language, not because of the correctness of the Examiner's position, but instead to advance prosecution to a notice of allowance or to reduce issues on appeal.

The Examiner believes Brown anticipates claims 1, 20 and 24-29. This is not correct, particularly in view of the changes made herein.


The Examiner's rejection of claims 2-7 and 13-16 relying on Brown in view of Kramer is similarly flawed, especially in light of the revisions.

Claims 10-12, 18, 19, 21-23 stand rejected by the Examiner relying on Brown in view of Montego Bay brochure (3200 Legend). The Examiner believes the brochure teaches a "hook" and "slit" arrangement. Undersigned can only locate an L bracket and a gas shock. Moreover, claim 10 recites a projection being received within the slit to allow articulation of the bench thereabout. Claim 11 requires a hook to coact with a slit to releaseably fasten the bench, while claim 12 requires a stand to hold the bench elevated above the bench supports. None of these features are in the prior art. Claims 18 and 19 are similarly free of the art as are claims 21, 22 and 23.

Undersigned shall contact the Examiner regarding the proposed interview,
should the Examiner find the foregoing unavailing.

Dated: May 27, 2003

Respectfully Submitted:



BERNHARD KRETEN
Applicant's Attorney
Telephone (916) 930-9700
Registration No.: 27,037